DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 475 SP 002 059

By- Williams, Thelma M.

Implementation of the Career Guidance Curriculum and Teacher Training. Evaluation of New York City Title I Educational Projects, 1966-67. Final Report.

Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Committee on Field Research and Evaluation.
Spons Agency- New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Oct 67
Note- 53p.
EDRS Price MF- $0.25 HC- $2.75
Descriptors- *Curriculum Development, Curriculum Guides, *Disadvantaged Youth, Dropout Prevention, *Dropout Programs, Experimental Curriculum, High School Curriculum, *Inservice Teacher Education, Occupational Guidance, *Program Evaluation
Identifiers- Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, ESEA Title I, New York, *New York City

This report evaluates a program designed to develop a new curriculum for disadvantaged eighth and ninth grade students in New York City who were performing poorly in school (academically, socially, emotionally) and who appeared likely to become school dropouts. The evaluation--representing the work of a multidiscipline team of specialists in guidance, curriculum and teaching, special education, psychology, health education, social work, administration, sociology, science, and psychiatry--consists of five sections: (1) an introduction which provides a history and overview of the Career Guidance program and outlines evaluation procedures. (2) an evaluation of the curriculum and teacher training including methods by which curriculum guides were developed as written documents; appropriateness for students of curriculum changes made; extent to which new curricula were used by teachers; organization of the teacher training program; supervisors and other personnel; and the specific orientation or support obtained through inservice training. (3) an evaluation of equipment and staff including the services of five guidance counselors, class sizes, and utilization of the equipment in five industrial art shops. (4) an evaluation of pupils to provide a base for future evaluation of behavior and achievement as ascertained through achievement tests, and (5) conclusions and recommendations. Appended are copies of instruments and a list of the evaluation staff. (JS)

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CAREER GUIDANCE CURRICULUM AND TEACHER TRAINING

Thelma M. Williams

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1966-67 school year.

Committee on Field Research and Evaluation
Joseph Krevisky, Assistant Director

October 1967

ED025495
SP002059

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I	Introduction	1
II	Curriculum Evaluation	7
III	Equipment and Staff Evaluation	19
IV	Pupil Evaluation	23
V	Conclusions and Recommendations	27
	Appendix A:	(No Tables)
	Appendix B: Instruments	B1
	Appendix C: Staff List	C1

CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

This is the final report of the evaluation of the program, Implementation of the Career Guidance Curriculum and Teacher Training, Title I, for the 1966-67 school year. The researchers were charged with the responsibility for evaluating a new curriculum developed in each subject area for students assigned to classes in the Career Guidance program and for evaluating the teacher training and other administrative implementations of these curricula, including equipment for five industrial art shops.

The Career Guidance program had its origins in a concern for the psychological and social well-being of disadvantaged pupils. Junior high school eighth and ninth grade students in New York City were selected as a group for whom help would be particularly beneficial, these young people being at a point in their lives where decisions need be made that have crucial implications with regard to their education and vocation. The aim was to develop a new curriculum for students who were performing poorly in school (academically, socially, emotionally), and who would be likely to drop out of school at the age of 16, the earliest legal opportunity.

During the 1957-58 school year, Board of Education officials and principals worked to create a program for these students. In September 1958, six classes encompassing the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades,

were organized in five junior high schools. In each of these schools, a teacher was designated Curriculum Coordinator to work with teachers conducting these experimental classes and to assist them in the preparation of special materials. Occupations such as food handling or the garment trades were chosen as the areas of learning.

In September 1960, the Junior High School Division appointed a Job-Placement supervisor to provide part-time employment for youngsters who wanted to earn money while in school. A study of similar programs throughout the nation indicated that a new teaching approach was essential in every subject area if these students were to be rehabilitated and redirected. By September 1963, teaching guides specifically designed for Career Guidance were made available to all the junior high schools participating in the program.

A team of specialists in each of the curriculum areas contributed to eight teaching guides: Guidance and Job Placement, Language Arts, Speech, Social Studies, Science, Mathematics, Industrial Arts, and Office Practice. The subject matter developed, significantly shifted its emphasis away from the program's previous job-centered orientation and concentrated more on the skills and subject matter necessary for further study in high school.

Following a program review by teachers, supervisors and curriculum consultants, the eight teaching guides were revised and extended to include Social Studies II and Social Studies III and in 1966-67, the series contained ten guides.

Starting with the five junior high schools in 1958, the program was expanded to include 24 schools in September 1962. In February 1963, it

was expanded to include 30 schools, and by September 1966, 52 junior high schools were participating.

The Career Guidance program was introduced only into schools requesting it, and comprised, within each school, of a unit of three classes -- with a maximum of 20 pupils per class. As of October 14, 1966, there was a total register of 2,289 eighth and ninth-grade students in 156 special classes composed, almost completely, either of all boys or all girls. Jobs were made available for approximately one-third of the enrolled students.

Teachers were assigned to work exclusively with these classes. A full-time Guidance Advisor was assigned to every school and was to see the students in the program at least once every week, and to meet with each of the school's three classes for group guidance twice each week. In addition, an industrial arts teacher was assigned, full-time, to instruct the pupils in pre-vocational skills.

An assistant principal in each school was to act as liaison with the Career Guidance program Coordinator as well as to supervise all other aspects of the program in his school.

The purpose of the Career Guidance program was to create a desire in the pupil to remain in school. This goal was to be achieved through intensive individual and group guidance, corrective work in reading and arithmetic, specially designed curricula, specially equipped industrial art shops, special organization (small register, "school within a school"), job placement, and occupational information.

The official objectives of the program set forth in the application for Title I funds were:

1. To improve classroom performance in reading and other skill areas.
2. To improve the child's self-image and school attitude.
3. To increase expectations of success in school.
4. To improve the holding power of the schools.

The following objectives were added to the program after the proposal had been accepted:

5. To provide pupils with skills in entry level jobs for part-time work while they were in school.
6. To introduce pupils to pre-vocational skills which will whet their appetites for further training in high school.
7. To equip them socially and academically for purposeful living, should they decide to drop out of school in spite of the efforts of the program.

Students selected for the Career Guidance program were to meet criteria for inclusion as specified in the Board of Education Guidelines for the Career Guidance program, September 1965 (see Appendix B).

According to the Guidelines, the Career Guidance program was not devised for students who might profit from other special services offered by the Board of Education, such as CRMD, Non-English classes, or schools for Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed children. Essentially, the program was intended for children of normal intelligence who were chronic school failures and appeared likely to become dropouts from school.

Pupils entering the eighth grade had to be at least 14 years of age at the time of placement. Priority was given to students who had failed more than three major subjects; were absent more than 30 days

during the previous school year; and were held over more than twice since the first grade.

Evaluation Procedure

The evaluation was organized around three broad objectives: (1) study of the new curricula developed and the teacher training procedures employed, (2) assessing the implementation of the New York City Board of Education's plan to augment staff and equipment, (3) study of the behavior and achievement of pupils enrolled in the program.

A multi-discipline evaluation team was employed, composed of specialists holding advanced degrees in guidance, curriculum and teaching, special education, psychology, health education, social work, administration, sociology, science, and psychiatry. Most of the team members have been directly involved in programs for disadvantaged children in a variety of city, state, and private agencies and institutions.

Equipment and Staff Evaluation

By personal interviews, written questionnaires, and observations, the researchers were to account for the services of the five new guidance counselors; the class sizes; the quality and relevance of the new curriculum, and the utilization of the equipment for the five industrial art shops.

Curriculum Evaluation

The researchers were to evaluate the method by which the new curriculum guides had been developed as written documents. They were to evaluate curricular changes made, and their appropriateness for Career Guidance students. Also, they were to determine the extent to which new curricula

were actually being used by the teachers in the classrooms.

Teacher Training Evaluation

The researchers were to evaluate the program organized to train teachers, supervisors and other personnel, and the specific orientation or support obtained through in-service training.

Pupil Evaluation

The pupil evaluation was to provide a base for future qualitative evaluation of pupils' behavior and achievement as ascertained through achievement tests administered during 1964-65, 1965-66, and 1966-67. The evaluators were to conduct group interviews and study anecdotal and attendance records.

CHAPTER II - CURRICULUM EVALUATION

The project proposal contained two distinct references:

> It is proposed for this year that some new curriculum be written in areas not previously covered and that the already written curriculum be further developed to include specific daily lessons.
>
> The new curricula already written will be implemented and information on appropriateness will be gathered for use in revision for the next school year.

It is apparent that the Career Guidance curriculum was viewed as a flexible series of guidelines requiring continual modification, extension and revision. Teams of writers had been at work since 1965, however, a complete set of curriculum bulletins was still unavailable by the summer of 1967.[1] To ascertain whether this first part of the proposal was implemented, the evaluators considered the following statement, written by the Director of the Career Guidance program in February 1967, as being relevant:

> The new curricular booklets were not distributed from the printers till the end of November 1966. Little was done with them in the schools during the month of December because of the many holiday activities and programs. Thus serious attention was accorded beginning with the middle of January. Since these booklets cover approximately a year's work, the material therein can not be covered by the end of the school year.

---

[1] There were, in effect, three types of new curricula: "revised," "new," and "emerging." The "revised" curricula were still at the printers as of May 1967; one of these, however, the Guidance and Job Placement handbook was available in galley proof. Six manuals, one each for language arts, science, industrial arts, social studies, and two for office practice -- a teacher manual and a pupil manual -- were published and distributed by November 1966. These "new" curricula had been written during the academic year 1965-66 under Title I funding. During the current year (1966-67), additional curricula were written.

Since it was difficult to establish which curricular materials were the specific effects of Title I funds for the school year 1966-67, it was decided to stress the fundamental issues of its total quality and appropriateness.

Specifically, the research team proposed to evaluate the development of the curricula as written documents by:

1. Assessing the qualifications of the curriculum writers;
2. Examining the methods and procedures of the curriculum writers;
3. Examining the theoretical and/or philosophical base for the content of the new curricula;
4. Assessing the relevance of its content to its stated objectives and to the students for whom it was planned.

To obtain information about the training and experience of the curriculum writers, the research team prepared "vita" sheets which the Director of the Career Guidance program was asked to distribute to the writers of the new curriculum. These forms were completed and returned by a sample of the curriculum writers who were currently working on the new curriculum materials.

A survey of the credentials and qualifications of those engaged in writing the curriculum suggests that very few were actually"curriculum specialists."

It was not always possible to ascertain clearly just which writers worked on the curriculum during the 1966-67 year -- the focus of the evaluation -- as opposed to those who completed last year's curriculum.

The units of the Career Guidance Series Resource Material for Teachers carry a section entitled "The Career Guidance Program" which sets forth the methods, procedures, and philosophy used in preparing the "new" curricula. A description of these procedures includes the following statements:

1. Curriculum specialists visited each of the schools that had been in the Career Guidance program from two to five years and studied the teacher-prepared materials in use, observed and conferred with the pupils in the classes, and interviewed teachers and supervisors to become oriented with the pupils' backgrounds, aspirations, cultures, interests, and needs.

   Workshop committees composed of teachers, advisors, and assistant principals were organized to work with each curriculum specialists. As the teaching material was developed it was tried out experimentally in selected schools and evaluated.

2. The subject matter developed departed largely from the job-centered themes and concentrated on the skills and subject matter necessary for further study in high school; less on theory and more on the functional and manipulative aspects of each subject area so as to present the pupils with true-to-life problems and situations.

3. The area of Office Practice was included to equip the pupils with immediate saleable skills for obtaining part-time jobs, and to motivate them toward further vocational work in high school.

4. Through a continuous program of evaluation by teachers, supervisors, and curriculum consultants, the teaching guides were revised and extended and the present series evolved: Guidance and Job Placement, Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies I, Social Studies II, Social Studies III, Speech, Science, Industrial Arts, and Office Practices.

Basically, the theoretical and/or philosophical foundation for the Career Guidance curricula is unchanged from the general and specific (for each subject area) descriptions provided in the 1965-66 evaluations of this program. The written statements of the Project Proposal, as

well as the introductory material in the Resource Guides set forth the philosophical base which argues the necessity for a new curriculum and specifies the content of that new curriculum:

> If these pupils are to be rehabilitated and encouraged to continue their education in the one year they spend in these special classes, a new and vital curriculum is essential. In every subject area (Guidance, Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and Industrial Arts) the curriculum must be based upon the pupils' backgrounds, aspirations, and culture, and must challenge them by utilizing their present interests and future hopes for the world of work. New courses will be prepared to equip these pupils with immediately saleable skills necessary for obtaining a part-time job while in school, and to motivate them toward further vocational work in high school.[1]

And as already cited above:

> The subject matter [will be] concentrated...less on theory and more on the functional and manipulative aspects of each subject area so as to present the pupils with true-to-life problems and situations.[2]

In response to a questionnaire developed by the research team, the Director of the Career Guidance program indicated the present purpose and direction of the program (See Appendix B).

> The general aim of the Career Guidance program is to create a desire in the pupils to remain in school and to continue with their education (See Guidelines, 1963). We hope to attain this objective in the following ways:
>
> 1. Intensive individual and group guidance
> 2. Corrective work in reading and arithmetic
> 3. Specially-designed curricula
> 4. Special organization (small register, "school within a school")
> 5. Job-Placement and Occupational Information

---

[1] Project Proposal 1966-67.

[2] Introductory statements of Career Guidance Resource Material for Teachers, 1966.

The specific objectives suggested by the Director were previously described.

The 1966 evaluation noted apparent contradiction in the two stated objectives of the Career Guidance program:

1. To keep students in school, and
2. To prepare students with immediate job competencies in the event they drop out of school.

Asked what she thought of that observation, the Director of the Career Guidance program in February 1967, responded: "I agree."

The research team did not agree with this two-pronged approach, believing these two objectives to be inherently incompatible.

The research team believed that it was necessary to create a clear-cut philosophic base, with which the curriculum writers could work. It is necessary for planners at the highest level to establish a clear priority between these two apparently divergent goals, the first one being to prevent school dropouts by helping these pupils to continue their education into the high school, and the second one being the preparation for the world of work for those pupils who are manifestly unable or unwilling to remain in school.

An examination of the content of the curriculum guides revealed that the lessons were creatively and artfully conceived as well as logically consistent. However, since their appeal is largely to the intellectual rather than the "functional and manipulative," it would seem that many of these lessons are inappropriate for the students defined in Career Guidance materials as the "target" group. Both in terms of difficulty and number of words presented, the vocabulary level of much of the subject matter of the curricula was certainly beyond the

ability of the students to be served. Data gathered by Career Guidance personnel set the average reading level of Career Guidance students at 4.8. The vocabulary control of the reading material suggested in the curriculum guides as appropriate for Career Guidance pupils does not reflect this finding. When vocabulary level is used as a criterion for comparison, the Career Guidance materials appear to be no different from materials regularly in use in other schools.

The underlying assumption of the writers of the Career Guidance curricula appeared to be that "manipulation of materials" (doing, practice, try-out, etc.) would result in giving students a knowledge of content areas similar to that which might be gained through discussion and through teacher demonstration. There is little research evidence to support such a contention. What evidence there is suggests that thought processes arise through language manipulation rather than through "manipulation of materials." The vocabulary load is crucial to ideational and abstract thinking.[1] Moreover, the research team believes that the student is incapable of benefiting from the "manipulation of materials" -- when instructions and explanations are framed in language beyond his reading comprehension level. Inspection of Career Guidance materials indicates that a high level of listening and reading comprehension is necessary for any meaningful application of these materials to "functional and manipulative" aspect of subject areas.

---

[1]Basil Bernstein, "Social Class and Linguistic Development: A Theory of Social Learning," in A.N.Halsey, et al. (eds.) Education, Economy, and Society. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961 .

The use of the idea of "functional and manipulative" as the guideline in the writing of Career Guidance curricula would seem to be irrelevant if Career Guidance students lacked the basic communication skills of reading and writing, listening and comprehending. There may be a serious question as to whether or not these "new" or "revised" curricula promote learning at all when the prerequisites to this learning are precisely what the students lacked.

Teacher Training

The project proposal describes the calibre of teachers required for the Career Guidance program as follows:

> In addition, these classes are taught by teachers especially equipped to handle this type of pupil. These teachers work almost exclusively with the career guidance classes and have developed special techniques which are shared in group conferences. It is the essence of the Career Guidance program that these "difficult" pupils be handled in small classes by highly skilled and interested subject matter specialists.

However, this description contrasts with the image of the Career Guidance teachers that the curriculum writers evidently had in mind when they prepared their materials.

A mimeographed sheet from Language Arts, distributed at a workshop conference of curriculum coordinators held on February 27, 1967, made frequent reference to "inexperienced" teachers:

> The regular format lists goals, skills, concepts, and attitudes to be achieved. For the creative, experienced teachers this is enough. However, many of our teachers are inexperienced and many are out-of-license. For these teachers, a detailed format is necessary.

From Science, distributed on the same day:

> Each area contains structured lesson plans to assist the inexperienced teacher or the teacher teaching out-of-license...

Herein is the crux of the training issue: If the Career Guidance program attracted highly qualified "specialists," cursory orientation and superficial supervision might suffice. However, if it is the young and inexperienced and out-of-license teacher who is assigned to teach students who were chronic school failures, different procedures and intensity of training are required.

In assessing the implementation of the teacher training program, the evaluation team found many inconsistencies and confusions. The following are some key statements made by the Director of Career Guidance in response to the questions posed in a written questionnaire, as well as the researcher's discussion of these statements:

A. "No teacher-supervisor training has been set up for the program for this year."

In the Project Proposal under the rubric of "Program Procedures," item 4 asserts: "A program to train teacher-supervisor personnel has been set up." The Proposed Project Budget provided funds for "implementation and teacher training" allocating monies for 125 sessions at $14.80 a session and 125 sessions at $22.20 a session -- budgeting $4,625 for these training sessions. This sum, however, was allocated in the budget for payment of trainers. No provision had been made to fund payments to trainees due to basic problems that involved general Board of Education policy on paying trainees. At one time, the researchers were given to understand that training would eventuate with

the trainees being paid at the rate of $7.50 for each session attended. Ultimately, this idea was abandoned. When payments to trainees were reduced to $6.00 a session, when Saturday mornings were set as the time for the sessions, and when attendance was indicated as being voluntary -- it appeared not feasible to attempt a training program.

At this point, the "training" became "evaluation" set up through a series of meetings in a workshop-conference format in which, according to a bulletin issued by the director of the Career Guidance program:

> ...the general pattern for these meetings will be to have the chairman of each curriculum area act as moderator and have one or two of the teachers who have been using each guide present his specific reactions and experiences with the material in the guide. Each teacher will express his general reactions to the material, his specific handling of the lessons and/or units, additions that he has found helpful, resources which he has used, trips that he has found helpful, etc... The major portion of the conference will be open to comments, suggestions, and experiences from the teachers who attend the conferences.

In a report on the third of these meetings, held for Social Studies teachers of Career Guidance students, a member of the research team stated: "This group was young, eager, and licensed in its field. The men outnumbered the women by at least 12-1. They seemed most responsive to the larger task of relating to Career Guidance youth. Their attitudes towards their students were positive; they believed in their students' ability to learn. They seemed to be making intelligent use of the Social Studies III Curriculum Bulletin." The moderator, who was the principal writer, pointed out the logic of the format: Themes, key questions, suggested approaches, and suggestions

for student research and inquiry.

Some of the following points were made repeatedly by members of the audience: (1) The late arrival of the Bulletin (December) meant that some topics had already been taken up in the classes; (2) the materials were generally rated as good, but really "just as" or "more" appropriate for a "brighter" student; (3) textbooks, workbooks, graphic materials, and programed materials are needed; (4) though it is difficult to follow through to get "homework" from these youngsters, it is really necessary for the teacher to demand it for the students' growth, self-respect, and for good parent-school relationships.

This meeting exemplified the value of such professional exchanges, and made evident the urgent need for real teacher-supervisor training for those working with Career Guidance students. Because this kind of session was very successful, the research team believes the opportunity for holding many meetings for each group should be provided. The effectiveness of <u>one</u> such meeting is questionable.

B. The training of Career Guidance teachers is handled in each individual school by the Assistant Principal in charge during his weekly or bi-weekly meetings with the Career Guidance Team and/or by other methods he may use for this purpose.

It is questioned whether assistant principals with regular duties to perform, given yet another assignment such as that of supervising the Career Guidance program, can offer effective leadership in this area. Moreover, if the difficult and crucial task of training teachers in a special curriculum is shifted to the assistant principal, can we assume that, in each of the schools, the implementation of the program is proceeding with equal growth-producing supervision?

Are assistant principals themselves equipped to deal with the specialized problems of Career Guidance pupils?

The answers would appear to be negative in light of the observations of the researchers in their visits to schools.

The training session for assistants to principals planned for December 1966, was canceled because of an emergency and never rescheduled. Since the proposed agenda was later distributed, the researchers were able to assess the materials planned for the training program , and found these to be superficial and not sufficiently informative to enable assistants to principals to take over the effective supervision of a highly specialized program.

Briefing of Advisors

A conference for Career Guidance advisors was held on February 17, 1967 -- the first general meeting of this group in the academic year 1966-67, and as of May 1967, the only meeting. Much of the time was occupied in dissemination of basic and evidently necessary information on the varied facets of the program. These included attendance problems, details of ordering materials and supplies for shops, the importance of accurate attendance records and record keeping, the value of job follow-up as good employer-school relations, opportunities in foreign trade work, and an introduction to Science Research Associates' materials. The multiplicity and diversity of problems covered seemed to have the effect of leaving the audience a bit overwhelmed.

The vital question of articulation between junior high school and senior high school, in itself a complex matter, was placed among the other items on the agenda. Faced with a March 3 deadline for the submission of applications to principals of vocational high schools, the advisors were still most uncertain about basic procedures in the application process. Furthermore, the discussion appeared to be long overdue since this meeting was held in February and the Minutes of the Meeting indicate that, for "screened courses" students' applications "should be prepared as early as possible, as early as November."

It was the observer's impression that the speakers, including the Director of the Career Guidance program, the Director of the Bureau of Attendance, a Supervisor in the Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance, the Supervisor of Industrial Arts Shops, Job Placement Supervisor, and representatives of the New York Trade Expansion Council were all very enthusiastic and generally extremely knowledgeable about their respective programs. But the excitement that they might have generated in the advisors never materialized. The advisors seemed alternately bored, detached, and anxious to obtain specific information concerning day-to-day problems encountered in working with students. It was only in the discussion concerning articulation that the advisors began to participate. Some advisors cited guidance counselors who gave low priorities to the applications of Career Guidance students; one advisor suggested that some principals of receiving schools seemed prejudiced against Career Guidance students.

CHAPTER III

EQUIPMENT AND STAFF EVALUATION

The major item in the budget ($119,000.00) was requested to equip five industrial arts shops in order to implement the special industrial arts program in the career guidance classes. However, the industrial arts materials were not ordered until April 1967 and the shops will not be available for use during the academic school year 1966-67. The researchers were precluded from assessing the effectiveness of this part of the proposal.

Regarding the augmentation of staff allotted as a result of the 1966-67 federal funds, it is difficult to partial out the effects of funds allocated for staff. The amount specified for instruction in the budget was $51,205.00, but changes in implementation -- such as dropping the teacher training program -- made it difficult to check out the actual expenditures made for staff augmentation.

A statement in the general description reports that:

> ...There is a guidance counselor assigned to this program. This counselor works exclusively within the Career Guidance Program and provides supportive services for the pupils and consultative services for the professional staff.

Yet, in February 1967, the Director of Career Guidance indicated some changes evident in the implementation of this statement:

> ...Even though five career guidance counselors were assigned, in practice they do not service the career guidance pupils because they are needed for general counseling in the schools to which they are assigned. Therefore, a position for guidance advisor was retained in the said five junior high schools.

Even if one overlooks discrepancies in implementation, the basic issue of the level of competence and professional qualifications of the advisors came to the attention of the researchers. When researchers visited schools with career guidance programs they found most advisors trained in areas other than guidance. It was the considered judgment of the research team that the advisors were, with few exceptions, unqualified in guidance procedures, foundations, and practices.

Equipment and Staff Evaluation

School visitations were made to evaluate the degree of implementation of the 1966-67 project procedures and to obtain an impression of the total effectiveness of the Career Guidance Program.

Following are some of the researchers' notes on schools visited:

School "A": Neither principal nor teachers were available for interviews. Proper orientation in career or vocational guidance was lacking. The Career Guidance advisor stated that there was a problem with attendance and the pupils were having reading difficulties. No Spanish speaking teachers, advisors, or aides had been hired in this Spanish speaking neighborhood.

School "B": Opportunity was not provided for interviewing staff members nor for observing facilities. Asked whether she believed her school needed a Career Guidance Program, the assistant principal said that it did not, that her students were already properly motivated.

School "C": No remedial reading was available. There were four teachers for the program and three Career Guidance classes, with a total of 35 students. The teachers were interviewed and two classes observed. It was reported by teachers that there exists within the

school a high degree of hostility among all elements of the school -- regular staff, Career Guidande staff, and student body. Career Guidance was characterized by some teachers as a "dumping ground" for children with behavior problems. Teachers criticized Career Guidance textbooks as too advanced for their students and complained of insufficient material and equipment for their classes. More emphasis on remedial reading was recommended. Some teachers appeared to be interested in their students and to have a helpful attitude toward them, but felt frustrated by the lack of similar attitudes throughout the school. There was evidence of a limited orientation program for new teachers.

School "D": Individual tutoring (mostly in reading) was being done. An interest in the individual student prevailed with services of the social worker and other psychological personnel being utilized. Teachers identified pupils needing help and referred them to the appropriate clinical personnel for this help. Home visits were undertaken when needed. Generally, teachers appeared adequate and interested in their students. Teachers appreciated the small size of classes and requested more books.

School "E": The Career Guidance advisor was interviewed by the researcher and found to be enthusiastic, and apparently well qualified for her position. Much time was spent in securing jobs for Career Guidance students. The four teachers in the program were considered qualified on the basis of their credentials. Two of the teachers were judged to be exceptionally good, showing more than the usual interest and skill. The principal of this school stressed the need for continuity in Career

Guidance to extend from junior high school to senior high school with co-ordination and follow-up procedures established. This principal felt that whatever benefit the pupils gained in Career Guidance might be lost during senior high school years.

The summary statement by the research team members who visited the schools faulted the program on the following grounds:

1. Insufficient orientation and supervision of teachers.
2. Insufficient and inefficient use of Career Guidance curriculum materials.
3. Insufficient remedial reading services.
4. Curriculum materials generally presented on reading levels that were too advanced for the students.
5. Teachers often teaching out-of-license.
6. According to the Director of Career Guidance, the five counselors employed for the program out of Title I funds were being used for general school counseling with non-Career Guidance teachers and pupils.

On the basis of their critical evaluation, the research team made the following concluding statement:

Without a careful audit by an independent agency of the money and staff time appropriated for Career Guidance, it is not possible to determine whether the Title I money is actually being spent to supply new staff and services for the pupils in the manner described in the Title I proposal. Fiscal and personnel auditing procedures should be established for Title I programs and regular reports made to the research organization that is contracted to do the evaluation. Unless this is done, valid accounting cannot be accomplished.

CHAPTER IV - PUPIL EVALUATION

Effects of the Program

The project proposal included specific procedures to assess the success of the projected efforts of the pupils. The Standardized Metropolitan Achievement Tests were to be used to evaluate pupils' growth in reading and arithmetic. Academic achievement in social studies and science was also to be evaluated through standardized tests. However, two problems were apparent to the research team. First, augmentation of staff and introduction of new materials were scheduled to occur across the board to all pupils in the program. As a result, the project allowed for no basis of comparison or means of control within the affected schools insofar as pupil groups are concerned. It was found, that in attempting to evaluate achievement in relation to the stated objectives of the paper, the projects were not timed in such a manner that any clear base line data on affected pupils could be established prior to the addition of new services, to be used as a means of comparing progress.

The research team studied achievement data on 91 pupils(or 29 per cent) of the 315 pupils in the ten Career Guidance Schools receiving Title I funds for supportive services this school year. Pupils' case records were examined in three schools with Career Guidance classes. The sample consisted of all three classes in one school, the "best" and "poorest" in the second and a "typical" class in the third school. The purpose of the study was not only to examine results of achievement tests administered during 1964-65, 1965-66 and 1966-67, but also to

study anecdotal and attendance records as a base for future studies. In looking at this data, it became apparent that the data could not be used in the evaluation for these reasons:

Only 13 of the students had been recorded as having been tested over the three year period. There was no way of ascertaining whether they were typical students or among the more advanced. In addition, the fact that the 13 students who had been tested were from the same school made comparisons invalid.

Therefore, the researchers could not report any standard achievement test data results.

Two other indices of academic progress were utilized. The first compared the number of major subjects (i.e. mathematics, English, social studies) failed, after the Career Guidance Program was instituted with the number failed in the previous academic year. The second considered the number of diplomas, certificates, and transfers earned after the Career Guidance program was started compared to the number normally expected before the program was started.[1]

With respect to the major subjects failed, cumulative records for 80 students were studied for both 1965-66, and for 1966-67. (Records were incomplete for the remaining 11 students.) These 80 students failed 85 major subjects during 1965-1966, and 74 for 1966-1967, representing a decrease of 13 per cent after their year in the Career Guidance program.

---

[1]A diploma is awarded to pupils who achieve 7th grade reading level, and pass 4 of 5 major and 3 of 4 minor subjects in their ninth year. -- A certificate is awarded to pupils who achieve 6th grade reading level and pass 3 of 5 majors and 2 of 4 minors in the 9th year. -- A transfer is permitted from junior high school into high school for a pupil who is 16 years of age by September of a given school year.

Concerning the relative frequency of students receiving diplomas, certificates, and transfers, the following may be stated: Students' records through the seventh grade lead to the expectation that from 7.7 to 10.9 per cent of the 91 students would receive diplomas. In fact, 32.2 per cent of the 91 did. The expectation was that 35 to 45 per cent of the 91 students would receive certificates. In actuality, 13.2 per cent did. Approximately 50 per cent were expected to receive transfers, and, in fact, 53.8 per cent of the total sample of 91 did.

The most striking change is in the percentage of students receiving diplomas -- a three to four-fold increase. A smaller number received certificates than expected, these students evidently having received diplomas instead. Since the largest shift was from the Certificate to the Diploma category, it may be inferred that the Career Guidance program has its most beneficial effects with those students who have better academic records before entering Career Guidance, and therefore are the better students, relative to the total group in the Career Guidance program. If they were in the zone between getting a certificate and a diploma before Career Guidance, they tended to get the diploma. If they were closer to receiving a transfer upon entering Career Guidance, they still tended to receive transfers.

In contrast to the previous evaluative data discussed, where a pre-Career Guidance base line was available, no such base line data on personality and attitude variables was available for pre-post Career Guidance comparisons. Anecdotal statements appeared infrequently and on an unsystematic basis in the records of some students, and provided an

insufficient basis for evaluating the effect of the Career Guidance program on pupils' attitudes and self-images. Positive statements were rare, as the majority of these anecdotal entries were critical in nature.

Nothing could therefore be said directly about self-image and attitude toward school and education. However, the pupil records provided suggestive information relative to attitude and self-image changes. They took the form of conduct ratings. These ratings were available for both the Career Guidance period and the year previous to it on the records of 75 of the 91 students (82 per cent). They were contained on Career Guidance pupil profile forms and on the pupil permanent record cards. Forty-six of 75 students (61 per cent) achieved higher conduct ratings at the completion of the program than they had attained at the end of the prior year. Thirteen students (17 per cent) declined in conduct and 16 students (21 per cent) showed no change. Career Guidance advisors also evaluated behavioral improvement in this sample of 75 students and indicated that 55 students (73 per cent) had improved, seven students (9 per cent) declined, 13 students (17 per cent) made no change.

It is evident that Career Guidance advisors rated the students somewhat higher than teachers (74 per cent vs. 60.6 per cent, respectively), but both groups indicated that conduct had improved in over 60 per cent of the sample. Also increasing the ambiguity of the findings is the fact that no base line for conduct was available. It cannot be determined whether students moved from poor to fair, from fair to good, or from poor to good.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the basic purpose of Career Guidance was to promote the social, emotional, educational,and vocational adjustment of students who might become school dropouts at this period of their lives, the quantitative findings of this evaluation in terms of the fundamental objectives are inconclusive. A thorough analysis of the impact was not possible in the absence of control groups or appropriately and consistently administered tests for the three year period.

It is suggested that, in the future, the research team be consulted when the project proposals are being formulated. This might make it possible to include appropriate evaluational procedures within the initial conception and design of the project.

It was the desire of the researchers to assess the effect of the Career Guidance program in terms of behavior change, such as improved attendance, enhanced self-regard, higher aspirations, and higher achievement scores. However, such assessments depended upon the existence of data for comparison, control groups, or clear base line testing of the variables which represent the objectives of the project. In the absence of such research requirements, the suggestions remain largely the considered, but impressionistic, judgment of the evaluation team.

Curriculum Development

Much effort and talent has gone into the creation of curricular materials that are often imaginative, well organized, and innovative.

However, the researchers doubted whether the new curricula, regardless of their intrinsic quality, were appropriate for this particular student population. The issue which cannot be avoided is the low achievement level and inadequate academic competencies of the target population. A curriculum which may be used for a regular eighth grade class is inappropriate for a Career Guidance group. Hence, in terms of a hierarchy of needs, the researchers were of the opinion that the proposed curriculum does not address itself to the realities of the problem.

Some of the salient findings of the researchers are as follows:

1. There is no evidence that the Career Guidance staff members carried out recommended research on the nature and needs of the target group as a basis for planning curriculum development.

2. Career Guidance classroom teachers and supervisors did not appear to be widely involved in the preparation of the new curriculum and materials. The researchers recommend that they be brought into the planning at the beginning of any new materials or curricular changes.

3. Though the Title I proposal states that a "new and vital curriculum is essential" for Career Guidance and though materials were developed in order to implement such a curriculum, the Director of Career Guidance indicated that "serious attention" was not given to this matter until January 1967. In addition, teachers were not required to use the new materials. The researchers believe that teachers should be required to utilize the new curriculum designed for this program.

Teacher - Supervisor Training Program

The Title I proposal stated that "a program to train teacher-supervisor personnel has been set up" for the inplementation of the Career Guidance curriculum.

1. In May and June of 1967, five single-session meetings were held , each planned for Career Guidance teachers in a different subject area for the purpose of evaluating the new curriculum materials. However, not all of the materials had been tested or used and some were not available at the time of the meetings. Furthermore, these meetings were so delayed as to offer little help for the current school year. Valuable as such sessions might have been, they did not constitute teacher training.

2. An assistant pricipal in each school with a Career Guidance program was made responsible for teacher training in his own school. The assistant principals were to have been trained for this role during a citywide meeting in December 1966. This meeting was canceled because of an emergency, but not rescheduled.

It is clear that the training phase of the Title I project was not carried out. Teacher-supervisor training was not mandated, and the participants attended on a voluntary basis. Since many Career Guidance teachers are out of license, it was particularly important that a training program be established. It is suggested that a 3-day institute be organized for all Career Guidance teachers prior to the opening of school and that regularly scheduled seminars be held throughout the academic year.

Supervision is in the hands of assistant principals who are already overworked and not always sufficiently trained themselves to administer such a program. Specially trained supervisors are needed to provide the necessary leadership.

Augmentation of Staff, Equipment, and Services

Although more than half the Title I funds were earmarked for new

shop equipment, it was not until late April 1967 that procedures for ordering the materials were worked out. Naturally, these funds had no impact on the program for 1966-67.

The five counselors whc were to be engaged for the program out of Title I money were being used for general counseling with non-Career Guidance personnel.

Without a careful audit, it is not possible to determine whether the Title I funds are actually being spent to augment staff, equipment and services in the manner described in the Title I proposal.

Pupil Achievement and Attitudes

The records of the 91 boys utilized for the evaluation were so incomplete (in late May 1967) as to render it impossible to make definite statements about the performance or improvement of these students.

On the basis of their previous academic records, all but seven to ten of the 91 Career Guidance students would have been expected to receive either certificates or transfers, rather than diplomas, at the end of the eighth grades. However, nearly one-third did earn diplomas. Over half (55 per cent) were given transfers. The major shift was from the certificate to the diploma category.

The total available evidence suggests that Career Guidance is probably of little academic help to most of the boys who fall below the certificate achievement level at the end of the seventh grade. However, it appears to be helpful to those boys who are at or above that level when they enter the program.

In the area of conduct, the records show boys received higher ratings by teachers at the completion of Career Guidance than they had received at the end of the previous year. The pupils' behavior ratings of the Career Guidance Advisors indicated that 74 per cent of the boys had improved.

Slightly more than half of the Career Guidance pupils included in this evaluation improved in their record of attendance during their year in the program. Nearly half regressed.

On the basis of conduct and attendance changes, it seems fair to conclude that Career Guidance is a positive and significant intervention in the school lives of between 50 to 60 per cent of the boys in the program. For the rest, it seems to have little positive effect.

For the boys who apparently were assisted by Career Guidance, there is no available evidence that it was due to Title I money. In order to determine this, a different type of research and evaluation needs to be carried out. A three-phase project is suggested. First, a comparable group of students who are not going into Career Guidance should be selected as a control group. Second, both the control and project students should be interviewed and appropriately tested during the late spring prior to the Career Guidance year. At this point, cumulative records should be checked and made as complete as possible. The interviewing and testing should be repeated during the program year, at its conclusion, and throughout high school.

Summary

A realistic appraisal should be made of the kind of program that should be provided for poorly motivated pupils or "pre-dropouts" within the period of one year. The researchers recommended that a full-scale attack, including trained guidance personnel, expert teachers, parental involvement, and appropriate and attractive curricular materials, could save these pupils from the dropout statistics.

The Career Guidance Program should restructure the "guidance" aspect of its program, first with a thorough study of its pupil personnel through a series of tests and evaluative techniques to identify those pupils with some scholastic potential, who must not be allowed to become "dropouts" and who can be remotivated into continuing their education into high school.

Its second major "guidance" emphasis should be concerned with the restructuring of the "image" of the Career Guidance Program, not as one stigmatized by association with failure but as one offering pupils a choice -- the possibility of utilizing this school year as a bridge or transition, either towards going on to high school or towards preparing for a work career, if continuing in school proves unfeasible.

For those pupils diagnosed as having the academic potential to continue their schooling, the curriculum must do more to involve them in the learning process. This means securing or creating materials geared to their reading levels. It means provision of content that seems functional and related to their out-of-school lives. Their curriculum should recognize the validity of the original project objectives 5 and 6 (5. providing pupils with skills for part-time work while attending school; 6. introducing pupils to pre-vocational skills which will be further developed in high school.)

For the other pupils recognized as being in their terminal school year, the program should be definitely pre-vocational in orientation. Emphasis should be placed on upgrading reading and mathematics skills, through individualized teaching techniques. Subjects such as office practice, industrial arts and the development of skills that seem directly related to their future working lives should be emphasized.

It is suggested that instead of the current emphasis on detailed lesson plans and curriculum materials, greater attention be paid to defining the appropriate educational goals for "disadvantaged" students. The focus perhaps should be on understanding the learning styles of such students rather than on producing teaching materials. The Career Guidance Program has, in its way, recognized these implicit goals by its emphasis on communication skills, and on the need to develop ego-strength and improved self-concepts of its students.

In conclusion, the 1966-67 research team did find some apparent advantages accruing to pupils enrolled in Career Guidance. The evidence is by no means clear or definitive. It is quite possible that an enthusiastic Program Director inspired a loyal staff to make the most of an undeveloped program.

Appendix B - INSTRUMENTS

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CAREER GUIDANCE CURRICULUM AND TEACHER TRAINING

List of Instruments

Introduction Letter	B1
Vitas of Curriculum Writers	B3
Parent Introduction Letter (English)	B6
Parent Introduction Letter (Spanish)	B7
Parent Questionnaire (English)	B8
Parent Questionnaire (Spanish)	B12

B2

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd St.
New York, N. Y. 10036

Date: February, 1967

Mr(s).
Principal
School
Address

Dear Mr(s):

As you know from General Circular No. 6, 1966-67, of the Board of Education, we have been assigned to evaluate the _____ program in the elementary, junior, and/or senior high schools.

The first phase of this study was completed in the spring of 1966. The second phase will be conducted during the next few months.

As a participant in the Program, your cooperation is vital and is earnestly enlisted. We are all too conscious of the imposition on your limited time and can only assure you that we will do our utmost to complete our work at your school as quickly as possible and with a minimum of disturbance.

The basic plan calls for visits by a team of people. The leader of this team is _____. All further contacts with your school in reference to the above project will be made through him.

Attached is a list of questions often asked by principals last spring. We hope our answers will be helpful. If you have any other questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 244-0300, extension 34.

Thank you kindly for your cooperation.

Respectfully yours,

Thelma M. Williams, Ed. D.
Director Special Education Evaluations

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York City 10036

February, 1967

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Mrs. Gida Cavicchia, Coordinator, Board of Education of the City of New York

FROM: Thelma M. Williams, Director, Special Education Evaluations, Title I and The Curriculum Team (Implementation of Career Guidance and Teacher Training -- 024)

In order to prepare its report under Title I, the Curriculum Team requests that all program writers, supervisors, and consultants who participated in the development of new curricula submit through you a vita (biographical data). It will be helpful if all of these are submitted in about the same form. The attached sheet is a suggested outline for the appropriate information.

VITA

NAME _____ SCHOOL _____

HOME ADDRESS _____ ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE _____ TELEPHONE _____

License(s) Held And/Or State Certification

_____ _____

_____ _____

EDUCATION

Degrees Held	Major (or specialization)
Bachelor's (or equivalent)	_____
Bachelor's	_____
Bachelor's (plus 1-14 points)	_____
(plus 15-30 points)	_____
Master's (equivalent)	_____
Master's	_____
Master's (plus 1-14 points)	_____
(plus 15-30 points)	_____
Other (please specify)	_____

EXPERIENCE

Teaching or Other Related Experience

Dates	Level	Subject
_____	_____	
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Experience Other Than Teaching

Dates	Title	General Description
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

ANY OTHER INFORMATION WHICH YOU CONSIDER RELEVANT (e.g., professional associations, publications, consultantships, honors, etc.) Use other side of the page if necessary.

Describe briefly the contribution you made to the writing of curricula for Career Guidance.

State as specifically as you can which parts of a curriculum or which curricula you wrote.

B6

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Committee on Field
Research and Evaluation
Title I

May 4, 1967

Dear Parent:

This will introduce_____, a representative of the Center for Urban Education of New York City who is responsible for evaluations of some of the programs in the New York City public schools.

We are asking a selected number of parents how they feel about the schools their children go to. We are interested in what changes, if any, they would like to see made to improve the quality of education that their children receive.

Your name was selected at random among the parents in the school that your child or children attend. Any information you may give will be kept in complete confidence, and the fact that we talked with you will never be made known.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Thelma M. Williams

Thelma M. Williams, Ed.D.
Chairman

TMW/mi

Special Education Evaluations

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION 33 WEST 42 STREET, NEW YORK CITY 10036 212-244-0300

CENTRO DE EDUCACION URBANA
33 West 42 Street
New York, N. Y. 10036

Mayo 4 de 1967

TITULO I

Evaluaciones Especiales Sobre Educacion,

Dra. Thelma M. Williams, Directora

Estimada Madre (Padre):

Esta carta es para presentarle a la Sra. (Sr.)_____ quien representa al Centro de Educacion Urbana, entidad responsable de evaluar algunos programas de las escuelas publicas de Nueva York.

Hemos escogido un numero de padres para preguntarles sus opiniones con relacion a las escuelas de sus hijos. Interesamos saber los cambios que Vds. desean, que se efectuen con el proposito de mejorar al educacion de sus hijos.

Su nombre fue seleccionado para que Vd. sea entrevistado. La informacion que Vd. nos de sera confidencial y nunca se revelara el hecho que Vd. hablo con nosotros.

Gracias por su cooperacion,

Sinceramente,

Thelma M. Williams, Ed. D.
Chairman

TMW:mo

Special Education Evaluations

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Committee on Field
Research and Evaluations
Title I

Dr. Thelma M. Williams
Evaluation Chairman
May 4, 1967

Special Education Evaluation

Parent Questionnaire

Evaluation form to be used in interviewing of parents with children in Junior Guidance, Special Guidance, Career Guidance or Special Schools.

Instruction to Interviewer: Please check "yes" or "no" or fill in answers where indicated. Write any comments you wish to make on the back of last page.

Information Data:

1. Name of student: _____
2. Address: _____
3. School: _____ Address _____
4. Name of parent or guardian (the interviewee): _____

   _____
5. Address: _____
   No. Street Apartment Zip Code

   _____
   Borough Telephone No.
6. Relationship of person interviewed to student: _____

*Warm up Items

a) How long have you been in New York?_____

b) Has_____(name of child) been with you all this time? (Yes) or (No)

If no (1) How ling has he/she been in New York?_____

(2) Where did he/she live before coming to New York?_____

1. In what school is your son (daughter)?_____ (Name or Number)

2. (a) In what grade?:_____

(b) How old is your son/daughter?:_____

3. Who is his teacher?:_____

4. What school was he in last year?:_____

5. What grade was he in?:_____

If child was transferred, how did the transfer take place? (Was there a hearing, was the parent told the reason for the transfer?)

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Is there anything different about your son's/daughter's class or school this year as compared with last year? No ( ) Yes ( ) In what way is it different?:

_____

_____

_____

7. Did you get any information, not mentioned above, about his school this year? No ( ) Yes ( ), what and from whom?

_____

_____

Parent's Name_____
Interviewer's Name_____

Dr. Thelma M. Williams
Evaluation Chairman

Parent Questionnaire
May 4, 1967

8. In your opinion has there been any improvement in his/her attitude (way of acting, study habits) at home this year? No ( ) Yes ( )

   In What ways?_____

   _____

   _____

9. In your opinion, have there been any improvement in your child's behaviour (way of acting) at school this year? No ( ) Yes ( )

   In what ways?_____

   _____

   _____

10. In your opinion has there been any improvement in his/her school work? No ( ) Yes ( ), in what ways?

    _____

    _____

    _____

11. What contact have you had with school this year?_____

    _____

    _____

12. Do you attend Parent Teacher Association meetings?
    No ( ) Yes ( ) 1 or 2 ( ) 3 or more times ( )

    If not, why not?:_____

    _____

Parent's name_____

Interviewer's name_____

Dr. Thelma M. Williams
Evaluation Chairman

13. Do you visit the school? No ( ) Yes ( ) 1 or 2 ( ) 3 or more times ( )

What initiated the visit (asked you to come)?:_____

Did you go because you were called or received a letter? Yes ( ) No ( )

14. Is there someone in your child's school with whom you can talk about his/her progress (how he/she is getting along)?: No ( ) Yes ( )

Whom?_____

When did you last talk to this person?:_____

Were you helped?: Yes ( ), How?:_____

No ( ), Why?:_____

15. Does you child use any special school services? Yes ( ), What kind?:

_____No ( )

16. Does your son/daughter talk over with you what he wants to do to make a living (i.e. goal)?: No ( ) Yes ( ). Do you think the school is helping him/her so that he can achieve his future goal?: No ( ) Yes ( )

17. In general are you satisfied with the help your child is getting in school?: Yes ( ) No ( ), what additional help do you think he/she needs?:

_____

_____

_____

18. How do you think the additional help should be provided?:

_____

_____

Name of Interviewer:_____

Address:_____
No. Street Borough Zip Code

Phone No:_____

Date:_____

Parent's name_____

Translation of Parent Questionnaire

Centro de Educacion Urbana
33 West 42nd Street

Titulo I - Evaluaciones Especiales Sobre la Educacion

Dra. Thelma M. Williams - Directora

Cuestionario Evaluativo para los Padres

Para ser usado al entrevistar a los padres de los ninos matriculados en los Programas de Orientacion Especial, Orientacion de Carreras Profesionales, y Orientacion en la Escuela Intermedia.

Instrucciones para el que entrevista:

Por favor, marque la palabra Si, o No, o llene el espacio en blanco segun sea el caso. Escriba sus comentarios al dorso de la ultima pagina.

Cuestionario para los padres

Informacion

1. Nombre del estudiante_____

2. Direccion_____
Calle

_____
Borough Zip Code

3. Escuela_____

4. Nombre del padre o guardian (el entrevistado)_____

_____

5. Direccion_____
Calle Apt.

6. Parentesco de la persona entrevistada con el estudiante_____

_____

Nombre del que entrevista_____

Nombre del padre, madre o guardian_____

Preguntas Informales Para Establecer una Relacion

a) ?Cuanto tiempo hace que Ud. esta en Nueva York?_____

b) ?Ha estado _____ con Ud. todo el
(nombre del estudiante)
tiempo? Si____ No_____.

1. ?Cuanto tiempo ha estado el (ella) en Nueva York?_____

_____

2. ?En donde vivio el (ella) antes de venir a Nueva York? _____

_____

Cuestionario para los Padres

Preguntas:

1. ?En que escuela estudia su hijo o hija? _____
(nombre o numero)
2. a) ?En que grado esta su hijo? _____

b) ?Que edad tiene su hijo? _____

3. ?Quien es su maestro o maestra? _____
4. ?En que escuela estaba su hijo(a) el año pasado?_____
5. ?En que grado estaba el o ella el año pasado? _____

Si hubo algun cambio, ?como ocurrio dicho cambio?_____

_____

?Hubo alguna vista, fue notificado el padre de esto y de las razones del cambio?_____

6. ?Hay algo distinto este año sobre la clase, o escuela de su hijo(a), comparado esto con el año pasado? No___Si____ ?En que consiste la diferencia?_____

?Quien le informo sobre ello? _____

_____

Nombre del que entrevista _____

Nombre del padre, madre o guardian _____

7. ?Ha recibido Ud. alguna informacion, no mencionada antes, sobre la escuela de su hijo(a) este año? No_____ Si_____

?En que consiste esta informacion?

_____

_____

?De quien la recibio? _____

_____

8. En su opinion, ?ha habido algun progreso o mejora en la actitud de su hijo(a) (habitos de estudio, forma de comportarse, de relacionarse) en el hogar en este año? No_____ Si____?En que consiste este progreso?

_____

_____

9. En su opinion, ?ha habido algun progreso o mejora en el comportamiento de su hijo(a) en la escuela este año? No_____Si____?En que consiste este progreso?_____

10. En su opinion, ?ha habido algun progreso en el trabajo escolar de su hijo(a) No_____Si_____?En que consiste este progreso?

_____

11. ?Que contacto ha establecido Ud. con la escuela este año?

_____

12. ?Asiste Ud. a las reuniones de Padres y Maestros de la escuela? de su hijo(a)? No_____?Por que no? _____

_____

Si_____?Con que frecuencia? _____

Nombre del que entrevista_____

Nombre del padre, madre o guardian_____

13. ?Visita Ud. la escuela? No___?Por que no?

Si___?Con que frecuencia?_____

14. ?Hay alguien en la escuela con quien Ud. puede discutir el progreso escolar, conducta, o problemas de su hijo(a)?

No____Si____?Quien es esta persona?_____

?Cuando fue la ultima vez que hablo con esta persona?_____

_____

?La ayudo esta persona? No____?Por que no?____ Si____

?Como la ayudo_____

_____

_____

_____ _____

15. ?Utiliza su hijo(a) algun servicio escolar especial? No_____

Si____?Cual o cuales?_____

_____

16. ?Discute su hijo(a) con Ud. sobre lo que quiere ser el (ella) en el manana? (meta, aspiraciones?) No___Si___ ?Piensa Ud. que la escuela esta ayudando a su hijo para que mas tarde el pueda lograr sus aspiraciones? No___Si___

?En que forma la escuela ayuda a su hijo(a) en esto?_____

_____

17. En general, ?esta Ud. satisfecho con la ayuda que su hijo(a) recibe de la escuela? No___Si___ ?Que otra ayuda piensa Ud. que el (ella) necesita?_____

_____

_____

Nombre del que entrevista_____

Nombre del padre, madre o guardian _____

18. ?Como, segun Ud., esta ayuda puede ser provista (dada)?

_____

_____

_____

Nombre del entrevistador:_____

Direccion_____
Calle Apt.

_____
Borough Zip Code

Numero de telefono:_____
Hogar Oficina

Fecha de la entrevista_____

Nombre del padre, madre o guardian_____

APPENDIX C

Staff List

Dr. Thelma M. Williams, Evaluation Chairman
Senior Education Associate
Center for Urban Education

Dr. Maria Angelica Bithorn
Consultant, Progresso Para El Viejo Chelsea
Bureau of Social Services
Department of Relocation
City of New York

Miss Edith G. Clute
Parent Education Consultant
New York City Health Department
City of New York

Mrs. Marcella E. Knights
Former Social Worker
New York City Department of Welfare

Dr. Gilbert Levin
Assistant Professor of Psychiatry
Albert Einstein College of Medicine
City of New York

Dr. David Mann
Psychoanalyst
Albert Einstein College of Medicine
and Montefiore Hospital
City of New York

Dr. Frederick A. Rodgers
Assistant Professor of Education
New York University

Mr. Lazarus Ross
Retired Junior High School Principal
New York City Board of Education

Dr. Don O. Watkins
Associate Professor and Associate Director
of Teacher Education
Brooklyn College
City University of New York

Dr. Israel Zwerling
Director, Bronx State Hospital
Professor of Psychiatry
Albert Einstein College of Medicine
City of New York